

Today's Topics:

ARRL Propagation Forecast Bn Nr 49

Callbook privacy?

Dual-band HTs: What's available?

Meteor Shower

Modifying Radios for out of band use

rec.scanners

What about for us SWL's ? Re: Tuning dipoles and antennas.

Date: 13 Dec 89 16:47:09 GMT

From: cs.utexas.edu!samsung!uakari.prima.te.wisc.edu!larry!sde@tut.cis.ohio-state.edu (Scott Ellington)

Subject: ARRL Propagation Forecast Bn Nr 49

Message-ID: <788@larry.sal.wisc.edu>

Does anyone out there understand the wierd propagation we've had on 20 Meters at night for the last week or so? The polar path is open, even though there's no sunlight there, but the Pacific path is dead. At the same time, the dark path to ZS6 is wide open.

K9MA

Date: Wed, 13 Dec 89 10:06:11 GMT

From: "Pete Lucas, NERC-TLC, Swindon U.K." <PJML@

Subject: Callbook privacy?

Message-ID: <13 Dec 89 10:06:56 GMT #0370@UK.AC.NWL.IA>

In the US callbook, do the publishers of the callbook have to get your permission to include your call? Or do the FCC give/sell the calls database to the callbook publishers? Is there any way of guaranteeing non-inclusion in the callbook?

The DTI (British equivalent of FCC) have a 'non-disclosure' box on the license application form - if you mark the box, they keep your call and address out of the 'published' list of calls.

Call me paranoid, but i dont want my address listed in lists! My home phone is ex-directory too (keeps the tele-sales people offering timeshare apartments away from me!)

..._. de G6WBJ

++Pete

Date: 13 Dec 89 14:12:19 GMT
From: young@ee.ecn.purdue.edu (Mike Young)
Subject: Dual-band HTs: What's available?
Message-ID: <13817@pur-ee.UUCP>

There's been discussion about the relative merits and tradeoffs between the various dual-band (2m/440) HTs now available and rumored; but for the benefit of us neophytes, would some kind, knowledgeable soul be interested in posting a short summary of the makes and models now or soon to be in manufacture? I am, for example, aware of the Kenwood (FT-75R ??), and I know Icom and Yaesu have at least one each, but have heard little about the specs and features, let alone the model numbers!

Those of us in ham-radio-retail wasteland thank you in advance :-)

-Mike Young KA9HZE
Purdue University EE Dept.
young@ecn.purdue.edu
...!pur-ee!young

Date: 13 Dec 89 16:38:02 GMT
From: oliveb!amdahl!greg@apple.com (Greg Bullough)
Subject: Meteor Shower
Message-ID: <16AD02zI740x01@amdahl.uts.amdahl.com>

In article <7404@hubcap.clemson.edu> bjb@hubcap.clemson.edu (BJ Backitis) writes:
>From article <2728@radio.oakhill.UUCP>, by charlie@oakhill.UUCP (Charlie Thompson):

>> Isn't there a meteor shower going on circa Dec 14th?
>> Anybody using VHF meteor scatter during this period?
>> Thanks in advance,
>> Charlie Thompson
>> WB4HVD
>

>According to the 1990 Old Farmer's Almanac, the Geminid meteor is
>occurring during the December 13-14 period, coinciding with a full
>moon (bad for observers, not too bad for meteor scatter VHF).

Well at 2330 last night, I was witness to a *VERY* low (lower than the 1200' mountain) meteor trail. So I can vouch for the fact that they're up there. :-)

Greg

Date: 11 Dec 89 11:47:28 GMT
From: mcsun!ukc!reading!cf-cm!cybaswan!cs9h9ral@uunet.uu.net (ra.lawson)
Subject: Modifying Radios for out of band use
Message-ID: <1301@cybaswan.UUCP>

What's wrong with modifacations ??

When I bought my Kenwood TH-75E handheld in the summer, the people who sold it to me (in England) asked whether I would like it to be modified to cover 130 to 170 Mhz (and 410 to 460 Mhz) receive, and a little out of band transmit...

Naturally I said yes and the xcvr arrived fully modded with the guarantee still intact. This is very commonplace in England and, as far as I am aware, there is no opposition from the DTI (our governing body).

The DTI will, quite naturally come down very heavily on anyone actually transmitting out of band...

By the way, I'm new to the newsgroup and I'm not too sure whether this article is actually getting outside Swansea University, Wales. I would be very greatfull for any reports of where it reached...

I think I can be mailed directly by either of the two following addresses:

cs9h9ral@uk.ac.swan.pyr
cs9h9ral@cybaswan.UUCP

Quote :: 'Marvelous, absoloutely marvelous !' - G4DXA.

Remember: White Rose Radio Rally - 1st April, Leeds University.
Meet the G4DXA!!

Thanks in advance for any replies - Richard Lawson... G7BPD (Back Pack Daemon)

Date: 13 Dec 89 14:54:37 GMT
From: robert@arizona.edu (Robert J. Drabek)
Subject: rec.scanners
Message-ID: <16110@megaron.cs.arizona.edu>

In article <37046@apple.Apple.COM>, chuq@Apple.COM (Chuq Von Rospach) writes:
> MROWEN@STLAWU.BITNET (Mike Owen W9IP) writes:
>
> >This is rec.Ham radio, after all. Scanner fans have every right to

> >air their views, [but] discuss [it elsewhere]
>
> If the ham radio folks don't want you scanner folks, then come on over to
> rec.radio.shortwave. You're welcome to join us until you decide you want
> your own group. (This is, in fact, one reason why rec.radio.shortwave
> was created was to get away from just this attitude.
> Chuq Von Rospach <+> chuq@apple.com <+> [This is myself speaking]

NO! NO! NO!

Rec.radio.shortwave was created to keep the noise level down or at least within a specific spectrum. Create a rec.radio.scanner if you want, I'd certainly vote a resounding yes, but we do not want our (shortwave) bandwidth chocked full scanner stuff, please. Most of us don't have the time to hit the ignore-article key too many times per day, and keeping things segregated helps a lot.

If you want to continue reading the things in the ham group, that's why it's here.

--

Robert J. Drabek
Department of Computer Science
The University of Arizona
Tucson, AZ 85721

robert@cs.Arizona.EDU
uunet!arizona!robert

Date: 13 Dec 89 07:04:36 GMT
From: cbmvax!grr@rutgers.edu (George Robbins)
Subject: What about for us SWL's ? Re: Tuning dipoles and antennas.
Message-ID: <8971@cbmvax.commodore.com>

In article <3279@kd4nc.UUCP> ke4zv@kd4nc.UUCP (Gary Coffman) writes:
> In article <5606@internal.Apple.COM> ems@Apple.COM (Mike Smith) writes:
> >In article <1260002@hpmwt1b.HP.COM> timb@hpmwtd.HP.COM (Tim Bagwell) writes:

> >What about us folks that only have a reciever?

> >

> >How important is an antenna tuner to the SWL?

> you use a matching network to transform the impedance at the antenna
> terminals to the 50 ohms required by most modern high grade receivers.
> A device that can combine both of these functions in one box is called
> a random wire tuner. To adjust it you simply tweak it for the loudest
> signal at the frequency you're using. Simple no?

OK, what are some examples of a "random wire tuner" that one can go out and buy?

I observe that Heath, MFJ and others have some "two knob" antenna tuners good for maybe 200 watts that might make sense for receive only use, however only the "three knob" ones seem to offer "inputs for random wire", but then the "third knob" is nominally for tuning connection to the "transmitter", which should be non-critical for receive only operation.

Anyhow, are either of these devices appropriate, or is it something else again that one needs...

--

George Robbins - now working for,	uucp: {uunet pyramid rutgers}!cbmvax!grr
but no way officially representing	arpa: cbmvax!grr@uunet.uu.net
Commodore, Engineering Department	fone: 215-431-9255 (only by moonlite)

End of INFO-HAMS Digest V89 Issue #1012
